

**From:** Glenn Maffei <[glennmaffei@gmail.com](mailto:glennmaffei@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 9, 2020 12:45 PM  
**To:** Ashley Clark <[aclark@walpole-ma.gov](mailto:aclark@walpole-ma.gov)>  
**Subject:** My written comments for 55 Summer Street project

To: Walpole Board of Appeals, November 9, 2020  
RE: Notes from Glenn Maffei, Board of Sewer and Water, 508-404-3812

The developer of the project proposed for 55 Summer Street, Walpole, should examine, through independent peer review, questions of water capacity and questions of sewer capacity.

I believe the Town is in a reasonable position to satisfy water pressure, water demand, and fire protection obligations -- provided that a sufficient looping agreement can be reached with the developer. When it comes to sewer capacity, however, the Town's infrastructure has, starting in 2005, experienced sewage-flow and sewage-pumping issues created by a prior 40B development specifically in this same part of town (The Preserve Apartments). These problems were resolved by the town after the fact instead of during that project's construction; they're also problems that we do not want to see repeated with the all-at-once addition of 543 bedrooms. An independent peer review would address this possibility.

On the Sewer and Water Commission's comment related to looping of water mains, the point here -- and this is an important one -- is that there is significant benefit to water quality when the water mains inside the development are looped with the water system *outside* the development. However, the developer's revised changes instead add a redundant and inconsequential loop within the development itself. It appears to be the lowest-cost option available to them and provides minimal, if any, looping value. In other words it may not even be better than had they changed nothing.

As a result, if these plans are approved as designed, which I don't recommend, and if the developer turns out to be wrong about their looping design, and still takes the risk, the burden of a weak link in our water system will be left for the community to deal with.

Further, in a separate comment, I have questions about the addition of 28% impervious surface. This project is being undertaken within a sensitive part of our water protection district (Area 3 of the Water Resource Protection Overlay District, "Primary Recharge Area"). Proposed impervious surface of 28% is well above the 15% called for in the Town's Aquifer Protection Bylaw.

At the Board of Appeal's Nov. 2 meeting, a representative of the developer said that if they don't have an order of conditions from the Conservation Commission that they will be getting those from the DEP instead. I would request, through this Board, that the DEP simultaneously address the Water Commission's aquifer protection questions.

Lastly, I would note that the developer has not responded to the Board of Sewer and Water's April 2, 2020, request for a project presentation and meeting. This meeting was offered so that we may make the above comments and engage in a meaningful dialogue about ways to move forward in an expeditious but also responsible way. On the developer's website, they state: "We understand the importance of being a good steward of the community, and we remain committed to working with the community to be a welcome neighbor." In that vein we are in 100

percent agreement and our invitation remains open, so that we may discuss these outstanding questions and so that we may work with you to be good stewards together.

Respectfully,  
Glenn Maffei  
Commissioner & Clerk  
Board of Sewer and Water